

**DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS**  
**Accreditation Study Work Group**  
**Topic, Issues and Options Matrix**

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Purpose of Accreditation	Refine the purpose of accreditation for California’s educator preparation programs, taking into consideration the policy and budget environment in California and nationally. <i>Does the current purpose of the Accreditation system as contained in the introduction of the Accreditation Framework reflect the generally agreed upon purpose(s) of accreditation today ?</i>	Continue purposes as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		Modify definition of purpose of accreditation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of accreditation: Assure Quality, Accountability, Foster Program Improvement, Adhere to Standards</li> <li>• Essential Attributes: Description of the attributes of the implementation accreditation system</li> </ul>
Role of CTC and COA	The Commission’s vision statement is “To ensure that those who educate the children of this state are academically and professionally prepared.” One of the Commission’s goals is to: “Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators. “ The COA has responsibility for implementing the accreditation system, while the Commission establishes policies. The COA reports to the Commission on an annual basis. <i>Do the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and COA under the current accreditation system provide appropriate oversight of teacher education and maximum efficiency?</i>	Continue roles as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		Modify the role of the Commission in accreditation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) COA representative reports at all Commission meetings</li> <li>b) COA information or consent item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate</li> <li>c) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA</li> <li>d) Eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions</li> <li>e) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission</li> </ul>
National Accreditation	Current law states that national accreditation of an educational unit or a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. <i>How or should National Accreditation of the Education Unit and individual Preparation Programs integrate with state accreditation?</i>	Continue national accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> , no change required
		Replace California’s accreditation process with national accreditation
		Eliminate national accreditation options
		Modify existing practice.

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Multiple Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to help candidates develop subject matter competence. <i>Should the Multiple Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review
		Collect ongoing data from programs in lieu of a site visit
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system.
Single Subject-Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Single Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to satisfy the subject matter requirement. <i>Should the Single Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review
		Collect ongoing data from programs in lieu of a site visit
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system
Blended Programs	Blended Programs that are approved by the CTC have submitted a program document that satisfies the six Blended Program standards. The institution must also have an approved subject matter and teacher preparation program. In addition many institutions have unofficial blended or integrated programs that serve the early decider. <i>Should Blended Programs—approved programs—be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process with on going review through the accreditation system
		Include Blended programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.
5 <sup>th</sup> Year Programs	Prior to SB 2042, the three Fifth Year courses were initially approved with no further review. The SB 2042 Fifth Year Programs are teacher preparation programs offered by institutions that have a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Preliminary Preparation Programs. One institution must recommend the candidate for the SB 2042 Professional Clear Credential as an alternative route to completion of induction. <i>Should 5<sup>th</sup> year programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process with no further review
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system as other programs

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Induction Programs	There are currently 149 Commission approved Induction Programs. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process to review the BTSA programs on a four year cycle. Now Induction Programs are the preferred path to earn the Professional Clear Credential. <i>Should Induction Programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process and ongoing review with Formal Program Review with oversight by the BTSA Task Force
		Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system as other programs
		Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system, BTSA Task Force coordinates the process, and the COA accredits the programs
Data Collection	Annual or bi-annual data collection on programs and/or the unit. Information gathered could be used to inform, and possibly structure, the site visit. <i>What type of data should be collected and analyzed 1) during the site visit, and 2) on an interim basis? How should the data impact 1) the accreditation decision and 2) the focus of the site visit?</i>	Yet to be addressed
Interim-Peer-Review Activities	Information was shared from the BTSA community on the informal peer review process which takes place in between the formal review site visits. The value of these activities for program improvement was emphasized. How can the accreditation system support ongoing program improvement? <i>What type of interim activities—unit or program focused—would support program improvement? Should the activities be voluntary or required?</i>	A standards based peer review process on an annual or bi-annual process. The process could be focused on the unit or the programs
		No interim review activity
Unit Accreditation or Program Approval	Currently California’s accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution—unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution’s accreditation decision.	Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process.
		Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision
		Develop a new blended system that addresses both unit accreditation AND individual program approval in a different manner.
Accreditation Decisions	Current Framework includes three options—Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations and Denial of Accreditation. <i>Does this menu of options need to be modified in any way?</i>	Yet to be addressed

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

2042 Required Elements versus Breadth and Flexibility	Prior to SB 2042, the standards had “Factors to Consider: and the review teams were guided by the factors. The 2042 Standards (subject matter, teacher prep, induction and 5 <sup>th</sup> year) have “Required Elements” and the reviewers are asked to hold the institution accountable for every element.	Yet to be addressed
--	--	---------------------